## **APPENDIX II**

## DETAILED RESPONSES TO THE SURVEY OF LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

This appendix presents the verbatim responses from the local governments that replied to this study. The questionnaire was sent by e-mail around June 7, 2005. Twenty-five of the 31 jurisdiction returned responses. Staff at OFM and at the UW interviewed most of these jurisdictions by telephone, but some responses were returned by e-mail. All jurisdictions responding were sent transcriptions of their responses, and asked to verify by July 6, 2005 if they were accurate, or to include edits to their responses. This appendix reproduces the verbatim responses from the jurisdictions responding to these requests. Responses to these questions are summarized in Chapter 3I of this report. The questionnaire used for this part of the study is included below.

Questions For Telephone Interview

period?

| Do your fiscal records generally agree with our table based on the State Auditor's data, as to the annexations and incorporations related to your jurisdiction between 1994 and 2003?              |
|--|
| Yes No   |
| If no, please describe what you believe are the discrepancies.   |
| How have incorporations or annexations affected your jurisdiction's revenues?  |
| How have incorporations or annexations affected your jurisdiction's expenditures? Please specify which service needs have been affected, such as police services or infrastructure costs.          |
| In comparison to annexations and incorporations, how important have other factors been in terms of their impact on your jurisdiction's overall revenue and expenditures over the 1994 to 2003 time |

|                         | Not Important | Somewhat  | Neutral | Somewhat  | Extremely |
|-------------------------|---------------|-----------|---------|-----------|-----------|
|                         |               | Important |         | Important | Important |
| Impact of Factors       |               |           |         |           |           |
| Other than              |               |           |         |           |           |
| Annexations or          |               |           |         |           |           |
| Incorporations          |               |           |         |           |           |
| (please specify         |               |           |         |           |           |
| factor)                 |               |           |         |           |           |
| Impact of property      |               |           |         |           |           |
| tax changes             |               |           |         |           |           |
| (especially. Initiative |               |           |         |           |           |
| 747)                    |               |           |         |           |           |

137

| Impact of  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| reduction/elimination  |  |  |  |  |
| of Motor Vehicle   |  |  |  |  |
| Excise Tax   |  |  |  |  |
| General Population   |  |  |  |  |
| Growth   |  |  |  |  |
| Economic   |  |  |  |  |
| developments (e.g.   |  |  |  |  |
| slow or fast   |  |  |  |  |
| Employment growth)   |  |  |  |  |
| Other Factors  |  |  |  |  |
| Please specify)  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. What other factors do you feel are critical in understanding the changes in local government finances |  |  |  |  |

| 5. | What other factors do you feel are critical in understanding the changes in local government finances for your jurisdiction between 1994 and 2003?                            |
|----|---|
| 6. | Has your city considered, but decided not to pursue, an annexation due to the perceived cost of service provision (e.g., police, capital costs).                              |
| 7. | Has your jurisdiction imposed impact fees as allowed by RCW 82.02 for cities and counties that are required to plan under the Growth Management Act? How have they been used: |
|    | 1. Streets/roads  |
|    | 2. Parks/Open Space/Recreation facilities   |
|    | 3. School facilities  |
|    | 4. Fire protection facilities in jurisdictions that are not part of a fire district   |
| 8  | What other comments to you wish to provide to us as a part of this research project?  |

Thank you very much for your participation in this research project. We will provide you with a summary or results from this phase of the project during the summer of 2005.

## VERBATIM NARRATIVES FROM LOCAL GOVERNMENTS RESPONDING TO TELEPHONE AND E-MAIL SURVEY

|                  | Q1 – Does the local jurisdiction agree with Auditors Fiscal Data, Population Data, Annexation & Incorporation Data, and Comments on these data? |
|------------------|---|
| Clarkston        | Yes   |
| Clallam County   | Yes   |
| Forks            | Yes   |
| Port Angeles     | Yes.  |
| Sequim           | Yes   |
| Clark County     | No, Both revenues and expenditures in the table seem to be about \$100 million lower than   |
|                  | the county's number.  |
| Battle Ground    | Yes   |
| Camas            | Yes   |
| Vancouver        | Yes   |
| Washougal        | Yes   |
| Yacolt           | Yes   |
| Pierce County    | Yes   |
| Bonney Lake      | Yes   |
| Puyallup         | Yes   |
| Steilacoom       | Yes   |
| University Place | Yes   |
| Spokane County   | Yes There was one minor discrepancy. Under revenues annexed population, the 80,702  |
|                  | entries for 2003 was actually due to an incorporation (not an annexation).  |
| Fairfield        | Yes. The population figures prior to and including year 2000 are wrong (those after 2000 are  |
|                  | okay). The earlier, erroneous estimates are from the census. Mayor Edwards did not have   |
|                  | the correct figures at hand, except for the 2000 population (607 instead of 494).   |
| Medical Lake     | Yes. Medical Lake hasn't had any annexations since 1992-93. There has been significant  |
|                  | growth in residential construction, but that has all taken place within the city limits. The city   |
|                  | may propose an annexation this year.  |
| Spokane Valley   | Yes   |
| Yakima County    | Yes   |
| Granger          | Yes   |
| Harrah           | Yes. More accurately, yes and no. See below. The annexation data provided is correct – in   |
|                  | terms of numbers of annexations and acreage. Other than property taxes, the fiscal data was   |
|                  | not exactly the same as our records show. For the most part it was difficult to understand the  |
|                  | categories (in the data provided) and have it match up with the City's information. We were   |
|                  | unclear what the categories – especially business and utility, misc. – included.  |
| Toppenish        | Yes   |
| Yakima           | Yes, however, the population estimates appear to be on the low side to them and some  |
|                  | population changes shown are not noted in the correct year. There appears to be larger jumps  |
|                  | in their population around the census years – indicating a lag in OFM population  |
|                  | adjustments.  |

|                | Q2 - Impact of Annexations/Incorporations on Revenues                                     |
|----------------|---|
| Clarkston      | No significant changes. The annexation in 2001 included an RV park that increases         |
|                | hotel/motel tax revenue.  |
| Clallam County | There has not been much annexation of commercial property to date, so the impact has      |
|                | minor. But, this may change and there is the potential for large impacts. The first major |
|                | commercial annexation occurred a few months ago, and this will reduce sale tax revenues.  |

|                  | Clallam just instituted a Boundary Review Board to facilitate boundary agreements between jurisdictions. Having the Board has helped to settle appeals, even before hearings.  |
|------------------|--|
| Forks            | They have had very little impact. Forks have not had much in terms of annexations during this period (1994-2003).  |
| Port Angeles     | Until very recently the city has not had any annexations for a long time. There is currently a 360-acre annexation pending. The area will be developed for industrial and commercial use. In the near term, they expect the impact on revenues to be modest and the impact on expenditures to be substantial. They view the annexation as a long-term investment that will benefit the city through greater economic growth. Eventually, they expect the annexation will add \$150,000 in revenues per year through property taxes and utility taxes (and, to a lesser extent, sales taxes). |
| Sequim           | Slight increase in property tax revenue plus utility extensions to new housing developments.   |
| Clark County     | Probably the biggest annexation was the 1997 annexation by the City of Vancouver. There was a detectable impact on revenues. However, population growth in the county was so strong that the revenue impact of the annexation was overwhelmed by the revenue impact of growth in the county. There was some loss of property tax revenue because the annexation was primarily residential. County avoided cherry picking by the city.  |
| Battle Ground    | The impact from annexations has been minor. However, we have seen a secondary impact from the growth that the annexations have facilitated. This growth has brought about increases in revenue.  |
| Camas            | Over the 1994-2003-time period the impacts have been negligible. Farmland was annexed in 1997 for industrial development, but until recently only one small business moved to the city. Since 2004, however, additional businesses have moved in and revenue impacts should become more substantial.   |
|                  | There was also an annexation of a residential area in 2004. This did add to city revenues through increased property taxes and real estate excise taxes. These additional revenues helped to stabilize their budget.  The city is in the process of carrying out two additional residential area annexations.  |
| Vancouver        | The City of Vancouver's revenues increased. Specifically, the property and other local taxes and fees revenues.  |
| Washougal        | Incorporations are not an issue.   |
|                  | They have had several annexations of land for residential development. These annexations have had positive impacts on city revenues as new, high-end housing is constructed. Residential construction has generated fees, sales taxes and property taxes.  |
| Yacolt           | Not applicable (must not have had any annexations)   |
| Pierce County    | Incorporations have had the biggest impact. Since 1994 three cities have incorporated. This has significantly reduced sales tax revenue, property tax revenue, and real estate excise tax revenue and development fees.  |
| Bonney Lake      | The impacts have generally been positive. For the most part, the annexations have been residential in Bonney Lake (there has been one commercial annexation), which has meant that there hasn't been much change. Undeveloped areas are perceived as bringing more revenues through development fees and impact fees. So, in the case of Bonney Lake, the annexations haven't changed much.  |
| Puyallup         | They have not had much impact. Most of their annexations have been residential, not commercial.  |
| Steilacoom       | There have not been any, so no impacts   |
| University Place | The impact of annexations has been negligible. The city did not carry out large annexations during this period.  |

|                | Prior to I-695 (passed in 2000), the incorporations of other cities reduced University Place's revenues through the loss of state equalization funds (which were financed through MVET). |
|----------------|--|
|                | Since I-695, incorporations have had only minor impacts.   |
| Spokane County | The county did lose some revenues due to the incorporation in 2003. However, they have   |
|                | been able to regain most of these revenues through contracts to provide services.  |
|                | The county has lost some revenues due to annexations (e.g., they lost a COSTCO), but the   |
|                | impacts have been only minor.  |
| Fairfield      | No impact. They have not had an annexation since 1986.   |
| Medical Lake   | Not really, since there have been no annexations in the period 1994 to 2003.   |
| Spokane Valley | The City of Spokane Valley just incorporated in 2003.  |
| Yakima County  | Annexations do not have much impact on the county's general fund – but they do impact the  |
|                | road fund because of loss of property taxes.   |
| Granger        | The city has only annexed vacant land. That has increased property tax revenues a little.  |
| Harrah         | We have seen 28 new residences on the 8 annexed acres. This has brought about increase in  |
|                | utilities and property taxes, which has been helpful. The developer put in modular homes   |
|                | (not mobile, but still modular), which created some tension in the community. Modular  |
|                | homes are less valuable in terms of property tax. If we see more growth, we will need to   |
|                | renovate our wastewater treatment. We are currently close to capacity on our wastewater  |
|                | treatment plant. There is not much available land for growth in Harrah and a limited amount  |
|                | for annexation because much adjacent land is tribal land.  |
| Toppenish      | There has been no significant impact because Toppenish has had no significant annexations  |
|                | from 1994 to 2003.   |
| Yakima         | They have increased their revenues, via sales and property taxes largely related to residential  |
|                | development. They have a careful process of evaluating the revenues and expenses of  |
|                | particular annexations, and typically seek to annex land that has become 75% urbanized   |
|                | (based on value). They use a 7-point test that needs to be defended before the Boundary  |
|                | Review Board established under the GMA. Their time horizon for doing this analysis is 2 or   |
|                | 3 years.   |

|                | Q3 - Impact of Annexation / Incorporations on Expenditures                                     |
|----------------|--|
| Clarkston      | No significant changes   |
| Clallam County | Annexations to date have not been large enough to have major impacts. There have been          |
|                | some reductions in law enforcement needs (though not enough to allow reduction in staff)       |
|                | and small reductions in county roads. The impacts on the county budget have been               |
|                | negligible.  |
| Forks          | Again, very little impact  |
| Port Angeles   | The pending annexation will have a large impact on expenditures. They will need to spend       |
|                | \$5.3 million on utility infrastructure investments.   |
| Sequim         | So far, just utility and street maintenance  |
| Clark County   | County thought that it would have to reduce the Sheriff's Department by 30 deputies due to     |
|                | the 1997 Vancouver annexation. However, revenue growth was strong enough from growth           |
|                | in the county that the county only had to reduce by 10 deputies. Now, it seems that cities are |
|                | mainly annexing undeveloped land for future expansion. That really has little revenue or       |
|                | expenditure impact on the county.  |
| Battle Ground  | We have increased the number of police officers. Utilities have remained pretty neutral.       |
|                | Overall, the changes in cost have been proportionate to the growth experienced.                |
| Camas          | Impacts to date have been minor. The residential annexation in 2004 (mentioned above) did      |
|                | not have a large impact on expenditures because services were already being provided           |
|                | through a contract (and the contract did not cover the full cost of the services).             |

| Vancouver        | The City of Vancouver's expenditures increased. The largest impact is on the law and justice        |
|------------------|---|
|                  | services followed by the natural resources and transportation.                                      |
| Washougal        | The rapid residential growth has increased the costs of providing fire and police services, and     |
|                  | the city has had to increase staff in the planning department.                                      |
| Yacolt           | (Not applicable) Must not have had any annexations  |
| Pierce County    | The county hasn't experienced much of an impact on expenditures from the three                      |
|                  | incorporations until last year. The three new cities all contracted with Pierce County to           |
|                  | provide services like police services and road maintenance. The charges and fees they pay           |
|                  | for these services have offset the revenue losses until recently. In 2004, Lakewood decided         |
|                  | to start its own police force. This reduced charges the county receives for policing, but there     |
|                  | will also be a reduction in expenditures for that as well.  |
| Bonney Lake      | We have increased the number of police officers, and there has been a slight increase in            |
|                  | public works and some expenses from required one-time fees, like conducting a census after          |
|                  | annexation. We have conducted extensive research prior to annexing to make sure that we             |
|                  | can handle changes. There are some issues with water supply and costs because Bonney                |
|                  | Lake has a contract with Tacoma for water.  |
| Puyallup         | They have increased expenditures. The annexed areas typically had lower levels of services          |
|                  | under the county, and the city had to spend to bring the levels up.                                 |
|                  | The impact on expenditures is typically larger (somewhat) than the increase in revenues, but        |
|                  | the city still carries out the annexations in order to simplify and consolidate the provision of    |
|                  | services. A typical example is the case of pocket county-islands within the city. This              |
|                  | complicates the provision of police, fire and street services (it can be confusing to police and    |
|                  | firemen).   |
|                  | Themeny.  |
|                  | Unlike some jurisdictions, Puyallup does not contract to provide services to outlying areas.        |
| Steilacoom       | There have not been any, so no impacts  |
| University Place | No.   |
| Spokane County   | There have not been substantial impacts, so far, because they have been able to contract for        |
|                  | services. They have had to reduce staff in parks and planning in a few cases.                       |
| Fairfield        | Not applicable. No annexations.   |
| Medical Lake     |   |
| Spokane Valley   | The City of Spokane Valley just incorporated in 2003.   |
| Yakima County    | The west valley annexation resulted in the loss of two police officers. To annexed areas. But       |
|                  | there was no impact on other gf-s services. Low interest rate loans from public works trust         |
|                  | fund helped compensate for losses in the road fund. Rad fund projects have still been               |
|                  | delayed.  |
| Granger          | Annexing vacant land hasn't added much to expenditures. The future cost of infrastructure           |
|                  | in those areas is a concern.  |
| Harrah           | Expenditure changes haven't been substantial. We haven't increased the police, though we            |
|                  | might like to. We contract our police through Yakima county police department. We                   |
|                  | cannot financially afford to increase police. If there are <i>more</i> annexations, we will need to |
|                  | update wastewater treatment. Interesting side note – about four or five years ago, the city         |
|                  | had to DE-ANNEX property because of our finances. We could not afford road                          |
|                  | maintenance.  |
| Toppenish        | There has been no significant impact because Toppenish has had no significant annexations           |
|                  | from 1994 to 2003.  |
| Yakima           | They have increased their costs, primarily to serve residential areas. Direct cost increases        |
|                  |   |
|                  | include police, fire, and public works. They incur indirect costs due to annexations such as        |

|                  | Q4 – General Response to factors other than annexations  |
|------------------|--|
| Clarkston        | Extremely important  |
| Clallam County   | (Not returned as checked in their questionnaire)   |
| Forks            | Not checked  |
| Port Angeles     | No response  |
| Sequim           | Extremely important  |
| Clark County     | Extremely important  |
| Battle Ground    | No response  |
| Camas            | No response  |
| Vancouver        | No response  |
| Washougal        | No response  |
| Yacolt           | No response  |
| Pierce County    | No response  |
| Bonney Lake      | No response  |
| Puyallup         | No response  |
| Steilacoom       | Extremely important  |
| University Place | No response  |
| Spokane County   | No response  |
| Fairfield        | No response  |
| Medical Lake     | No response  |
| Spokane Valley   | No response  |
| Yakima County    | Initiative 747 and the repeal of the mvet have had a much bigger impact on our finances than annexations and incorporations. The general fund will lose \$25 million over a five-year period due to the initiatives; and the road fund will lose about \$10 million. |
| Granger          | No response  |
| Harrah           | No response  |
| Toppenish        | No response  |
| Yakima           | No response  |

|                | Q4 – Impact of property tax changes (e.g. initiative 747)  |
|----------------|--|
| Clarkston      | Somewhat important   |
| Clallam County | Extremely Important  |
| Forks          | Somewhat Important   |
| Port Angeles   | Somewhat Important. Note (1): Initiative 747 has not had that much impact to date (it has not been binding), but it will likely have greater impact in the future. Property assessed values have not been increasing much, and they have been operating at statutory rate limits.  |
| Sequim         | Somewhat important   |
| Clark County   | Somewhat important <b>I-747:</b> This probably has had the greatest impact on county finances. Counties are primarily financed by property taxes. I-747 limited growth to one percent from six percent, a huge change. In addition, the one percent limit forces the levy rate down each year. That means that the levy rate that is applied to new construction gets lower each year. Eventually, the growth rate of property taxes for everything, including new construction will be close to one percent. This greatly constrains county revenues. |
| Battle Ground  | Neutral/Somewhat Important— at first, this didn't impact us, be we anticipate it will be more important in the future - (this is why two boxes are marked)   |
| Camas          | Extremely important (most important factor)  |
| Vancouver      | Extremely important  |
| Washougal      | Extremely important - they do not have a strong retail base and rely on property taxes; 747 has limited the ability to raise revenues  |

| Yacolt           | Somewhat important  |
|------------------|---|
| Pierce County    | Extremely important This has had a big impact on county revenues. Pierce County has lost        |
|                  | millions every year because of the initiative. It's not been put on the ballot to exceed the    |
|                  | limits.   |
| Bonney Lake      | Very Important Has impacted Bonney Lake, but not as much as other places since many             |
|                  | efforts have made to find other revenue sources.  |
| Puyallup         | Extremely important - limits revenues and, therefore, services                                  |
| Steilacoom       | Extremely important   |
| University Place | Somewhat important (increases fell from 6% to 1%the city has lost about \$150k per year)        |
| Spokane County   | Extremely Important (property taxes account for about 32% or revenues)                          |
| Fairfield        | Extremely important - this has had a dramatic impact on rates                                   |
| Medical Lake     | Extremely important I-747: Medical Lake has experienced an increase in the value of             |
|                  | residential property recently, but this happened after the passage of I-747. So, the city was   |
|                  | not able to realize any significant increase in property tax levies. The mayor and city council |
|                  | have, with one exception, chosen to stick with the I-747 limits rather than voting to exceed    |
|                  | them.   |
| Spokane Valley   | Extremely Important I-747: Restraints on property tax levy growth significantly affect city     |
|                  | revenues.   |
| Yakima County    | See narrative   |
| Granger          | Extremely important   |
| Harrah           | Somewhat important  |
| Toppenish        | Somewhat important I-747. This has had some impact on Toppenish, but not as much                |
|                  | perhaps as other jurisdictions. Property taxes aren't as important since the property tax base  |
|                  | in Toppenish isn't as big as most other cities this size and there has been relatively slow     |
|                  | growth in assessed value.   |
| Yakima           | Extremely important - negative  |

|                | Q4 – Impact of elimination of MVET)  |
|----------------|--|
| Clarkston      | Extremely important  |
| Clallam County | Somewhat important   |
| Forks          | Extremely important (This has hurt them badly)   |
| Port Angeles   | Extremely important Note (2): They have lost about \$300,000 in revenues due to the MVET reduction/elimination and it has been a struggle to balance their budget. They have not cut essential services, but they have cut employee benefits. This has made it more difficult to recruit staff and is causing them problems.   |
| Sequim         | Somewhat important   |
| Clark County   | Extremely important Repeal of MVET: Although counties received a much smaller part of MVET distributions than cities, it still had a significant impact on Clark County. In addition, the City of Vancouver shared some of their MVET distributions with the county – this also went away with MVET repeal. Although public health that had been funded through MVET was partially funded by the state, the state made public health funding a county mandate instead of a county and city mandate as it had been (theoretically) before MVET repeal. This has put more of a financial burden on the county. |
| Battle Ground  | Somewhat important   |
| Camas          | Somewhat important   |
| Vancouver      | Extremely important  |
| Washougal      | Neutral - they were not eligible for sales tax equalization  |
| Yacolt         | Extremely important  |
| Pierce County  | Somewhat important While not as large of an impact as I-747 (because counties still  |

|                  | received a small proportion of MVET distributions) this loss did substantially affect road         |
|------------------|--|
|                  | improvement funding.   |
| Bonney Lake      | Extremely Important–has impacted Bonney Lake, but not as much as other places since                |
|                  | many efforts have made to find other revenue sources.  |
| Puyallup         | Extremely important  |
| Steilacoom       | Extremely important  |
| University Place | Extremely important the city lost about a third of their revenues                                  |
| Spokane County   | Extremely important  |
| Fairfield        | Extremely important - (695 and sales tax equalization have reduced revenues \$32k per year)        |
| Medical Lake     | Extremely important MVET elimination: This was probably the single biggest impact on               |
|                  | the city. The city relied heavily on MVET distributions for fire and police and for sales tax      |
|                  | equalization. There is essentially no retail activity in the city, so there is no retail sales tax |
|                  | base. Residents rely on the military base or Spokane for shopping. Elimination of MVET             |
|                  | and to a lesser extent I-747 has led to significant budget cutbacks and elimination of 6 FTEs.     |
|                  | This has caused a reduction in services.   |
| Spokane Valley   | Somewhat important MVET repeal: Although Spokane Valley was incorporated after repeal              |
|                  | of MVET, it still would be nice to have the revenue for criminal justice, fire protection and      |
|                  | transportation purposes.   |
| Yakima County    | See narrative  |
| Granger          | Extremely important  |
| Harrah           | Extremely important. Loss of sales tax equalization (retail sales in Harrah are very limited)—     |
|                  | MVET was quite significant for Harrah  |
| Toppenish        | Extremely Important Toppenish was much more reliant on MVET distributions than                     |
|                  | property taxes.  |
| Yakima           | Extremely important - negative   |

|                | Q4 – Impact of general population growth   |
|----------------|--|
| Clarkston      | Neutral  |
| Clallam County | Neutral  |
| Forks          | Not Important  |
| Port Angeles   | Not important – have not had much population growth  |
| Sequim         | Neutral  |
| Clark County   | Extremely important  |
|                | General population growth: This has been very important to the county. The county has      |
|                | experienced a great deal of population growth. This has brought in more revenues but also  |
|                | increased expenditures. While this has mostly balanced out, population growth has had a    |
|                | huge impact on the county. This has happened partially because the area north of Vancouver |
|                | has not been annexed and there has been a great deal of population growth there.           |
| Battle Ground  | Extremely important– this has been the most important factor                               |
| Camas          | Somewhat important - they have had to cut back on activities and services                  |
| Vancouver      | Extremely important  |
| Washougal      | Extremely important - have had about 400 housing starts a year                             |
| Yacolt         | Neutral  |
| Pierce County  | Neutral This seems to have been pretty much a wash. Population growth has brought          |
|                | increased revenues but also increased expenditures. Revenues and expenditures have tended  |
|                | to more or less offset each other.   |
| Bonney Lake    | Very important we are growing fast; population has increased 40-50% over the past few      |
|                | years.   |
| Puyallup       | Not important, growth has been manageable  |
| Steilacoom     | Not important, they have not had any population growth                                     |

| University Place | Not very important: population growth is modest  |
|------------------|--|
| Spokane County   | Somewhat important   |
| Fairfield        | Not important – population stable  |
| Medical Lake     | Extremely important <b>General Population Growth:</b> While the population figures show        |
|                  | little change in Medical Lake's population, there has been a significant change in the non-    |
|                  | institutional population. The population at Eastern States Hospital has declined, but this has |
|                  | been offset by general population growth within the city limits. Commuters from Spokane        |
|                  | and from Fairchild make up a large part of this new population growth.                         |
| Spokane Valley   | Extremely important  |
| Yakima County    | See narrative  |
| Granger          | Somewhat important   |
| Harrah           | Not important. don't see pop growth as factor  |
| Toppenish        | Neutral Toppenish has had relatively little population growth since 1994.                      |
| Yakima           | Not important – they have very little infill growth  |

|                  | Q4 – Scale – impact of other factors   |
|------------------|--|
| Clarkston        | No response  |
| Clallam County   | No response  |
| Forks            | No response  |
| Port Angeles     | No response  |
| Sequim           | No response  |
| Clark County     | Extremely important, see their response to Q5  |
| Battle Ground    | No response  |
| Camas            | No response  |
| Vancouver        | Extremely important. Services already provided for Fire/Water/Sewer/Drainage   |
| Washougal        | No response  |
| Yacolt           | No response  |
| Pierce County    | Extremely important, See their response to #5  |
| Bonney Lake      | No comments  |
| Puyallup         | None identified  |
| Steilacoom       | Extremely important. They lost one industrial plant, and that cost them significant revenue  |
| University Place | No response  |
| Spokane County   | No response  |
| Fairfield        | No response  |
| Medical Lake     | No response  |
| Spokane Valley   | No response  |
| Yakima County    | See narrative  |
| Granger          | No response  |
| Harrah           | Somewhat Important Fire district contract has been very difficult financially. The city must pay ½ of property taxes on this. The city and property owners in the surrounding support much of the surrounding tribal areas fire protection because of the system of allocating this service and its cost.  |
| Toppenish        | Extremely Important. Toppenish is located on the Yakima Indian Reservation. This presents several problems. First, the Yakima Nation has been circumspect about growth in Toppenish and the other two cities on the reservation, Harrah and Wapato. Any expansion, annexations or economic development would have to be approved by the tribe. Second, Toppenish does not have certificated water rights. It applied to the state Department of Ecology for water rights and has been referred to the Yakima's for certificated rights. Without certificated water rights the city couldn't guarantee water to any economic development opportunities or residential expansions. Lack of water rights is a big deal. |

|        | Third, it seems that enrolled members of the Yakima Nation are exempt from sales tax.          |
|--------|--|
|        | That represents a quite large base of retail sales that are not taxable. There doesn't seem to |
|        | be any state law to support this, but the state Department of Revenue allows it. If those      |
|        | sales were taxable, Toppenish's sales tax revenue might increase by as much as one third.      |
| Yakima | No response  |

|                | Q5 - Other items that they consider important in considering local government finances  |
|----------------|---|
| Clarkston      | Clarkston has not seen any major changes in population or industry during this time period.  Major factors have been changes in the property tax laws and the loss of MVET.   |
| Clallam County | The Growth Management Act itself. The legislature has not addressed the revenue shifts caused by the Act. In rural counties, the Act is interpreted as restricting commercial activities. Cities are critical if a county tries to create a rural commercial zone. Counties do not have the ability to create revenues through commercial development. Counties are not allowed to charge utility taxes. Property taxes do not cover the costs of services, and sales taxes are limited. The Act is killing rural counties. |
| Forks          | State and federal government regulations and unfunded mandates have hurt them. Jobs have been lost due to environmental regulations (spotted owl hurting logging, air quality regulations hurting shake and shingle mills), fishing regulations, and proposed closures of government installations (they had to fight to keep the coast guard from closing a local station).  |
| Port Angeles   | It has been difficult to comply with some state mandates (e.g., environmental mandates have forced them to raise sewer fees substantially). They need help acquiring funds for needed infrastructure projects (bridge repairs, roads).  |
| Sequim         | No response   |
| Clark County   | Unfunded state mandates have had a great impact on the county. Criminal justice costs related to legislation, the recently increased costs of indigent defense, the expense of complying with SEPA in county road building have all adversely impacted the county budget. Recent redistribution of mental health care funds is also a factor at both federal and state levels.  |
| Battle Ground  | A balanced tax base is very important. We are fortunate to have a balance between business, sales, and property taxes.  |
| Camas          | Cities should be given greater flexibility on how to use real estate excise tax revenues.  They should be able to use these funds more for operations. This would help to supplant property tax limitations.  They have had some difficulty competing with Oregon for business investments, because   |
|                | Oregon has more tools for attracting investments. There is a need for tax increment financing.  |
| Vancouver      | Annexations. Portland/Vancouver economy and growth. Increasing expenditures with revenues not keeping pace. Elimination of Business and Occupancy Taxes. Increase in the non-voted debt load. In 1997 the City started to provide Park Services in Vancouver and Clark County.  |
| Washougal      | Historical lows in interest rates have contributed to the housing boom.   |
|                | Oregon's tax structure has encouraged people to move to Washougal from Oregon.  |
|                | Being a border city, Washington's sales tax legislation constrains their ability to develop a retail base. It's too easy for their residents to shop in Oregon.   |
| Yacolt         | Insurance – both health and liability   |
| Pierce County  | Costs for employees, especially health insurance, have increased rapidly. Also, pension rates were raised by the state recently.  |

| Bonney Lake      | The City of Bonney Lake is facing some huge changes in population, not just in terms of growth, but also in demographics. We have a whole new constituency, especially made up of new families. We don't have the infrastructure to accommodate these new families. We   |
|------------------|--|
|                  | have one park – donated in the 1970s. We don't have support for our needs. There is no   |
|                  | money for parks, for transportation, for streetlights. How do we build a city hall that holds  |
|                  | all employees? How can we keep up with the growth in general? We have increased  |
|                  | system development charges to raise funds. In addition, we are trying to develop a long-   |
|                  | term plan on how to handle these issues. Recently, we applied for trust fund loans.  |
| Puyallup         | Employee health care costs have been increasing dramatically (15-20% a year). This has been the most serious factor affecting their budget. Rising health care costs have put  |
| G . 11           | pressure on capital expenditures and may limit service levels in the future.   |
| Steilacoom       | They have had significantly increased costs due to binding arbitration for policy and fire personnel costs. They have also had significant cost increases for medical benefits.  |
| University Place | They have been hurt by state unfunded mandates (restrictions and regulations). Examples include: the prevailing wage law (which they believe adds 20 percent to construction costs) and purchasing; bidding requirements (it is often cheaper to carry out work in-house, but the requirements prevent them from doing so); not enough grand funding is provided by the state to cover growth management planning; build able lands (they are required to inventory vacant/underdeveloped land and track and report to the state); density requirements; shoreline management regulations; water quality standards (storm water management regulations). |
|                  | Economic development and the need for tax increment financing  |
|                  | Sales tax distribution—The point of sale distribution is not fair. The Streamlined Sales Tax should be passed to provide more equitable sales tax distribution to cities.  |
|                  | Sales Tax Equalization Backfill—Pre-I695, the City received almost \$3 million per year. Now equalization backfill from the state only amounts to \$100k. Meanwhile, Sales Tax Equalization is still the law of the land—it's just not being funded.   |
|                  | Land Assembly—give cities the same rights and abilities that ports have when it comes to land assembly.  |
|                  | LID formation—The "assessment to benefit" test for LIDs makes it very difficult (often impossible) to form LIDs and fund much needed local improvements (sewers, roads, street lights, etc.).  |
| Spokane County   | The major factors have been the loss of MVET and the limits on property taxes. State and court unfunded mandates have had important impacts. Incorporations have played a role, but these other factors have been more important.  |
| Deer Park        | Somewhat important, see q. 5   |
| Fairfield        | Sales tax equalization has hurt them.  |
|                  | The cost of their law enforcement services contract with the county has increased dramatically (from \$10k to \$32k per year). This, coupled with declines in state criminal justice funds, is hurting them.   |
| Medical Lake     | The most important factor is Eastern States Hospital. This state facility occupies about 50 percent of the area within the city limits. The state pays no property tax to the city on this area. It contracts with the city for fire protection, but does not have to pay of police services which cost the city several times the cost of fire protection. Also, Fairchild Air Base is only a few miles away. Military residents rely on the base for shopping.   |
|                  | Commuters to Spokane and many local residents do their shopping in Spokane. As a   |
|                  | consequence, there is practically no commercial development in the city. Last year a   |

|                | grocery store was built, the first significant retail commercial construction in 20 years.  |
|----------------|---|
|                | Most of the city's retail sales tax base is derived from residential construction.  |
| Spokane Valley | The city and its elected officials are all new to running a city. We are looking at our options on both the revenue and expenditure side of the balance sheet. We have a lot of learning yet to do.   |
|                | One of the things we have noticed that significantly impacts our city is unfunded mandates from the state.  |
| Yakima County  | The initiatives have been the big thing for us. Also, unfunded state mandates continue to place a burden on county finances.  |
| Granger        | Initiatives and referenda have had by far the biggest impact on Granger. In the wake of I-695 and I-747 we had to close the municipal swimming pool and cut back on employment and other services. However, the demand for services actually increased. People didn't understand that voting for the initiatives and referenda was going to reduce funding for things they want.  |
| Harrah         | The City of Harrah didn't see many changes in taxes or fees. We are now allocating a few more expenses to the sewer and water funds. It is the current expense or general government. The town utility tax in 2004 on sewer and water was increased from 6% to 12%. Utility fees have been increased slightly.  |
| Toppenish      | For Toppenish, the increased cost of providing services has typically exceeded revenue growth. That makes it hard just to maintain a steady level of services much less increase the level of services. Items like energy costs, fuel costs and health insurance costs have all been rising much more rapidly that revenues have been growing. This is probably true for all cities.  |
| Yakima         | • The strong agricultural base in the valley has had both positive and negative impacts on the local economy. It has been and remains a large economic driver in the area supporting both directly and in-directly related businesses. However, it is a seasonal and cyclical industry that keeps wages low and has minimized incentives for economic diversification in the past.  |
|                | • However, recently the city has experienced general growth of the local economy including diversification from traditional agriculture. They have had several call centers established, including one that moved to India. They are providing incentives for developments of this type (such as Renewal Community federal tax incentives and Section 108 HUD loans to help attract new capital investment. They are also gaining business (such as metal fabrication) in relation to waste remediation activity at Hanford. Their airport has had much more storage activity for Westside aircraft owners, who seek to take advantage of their dry climate. They have also had plastic mfg. develop, as well as tourist activity in relation to the growth of the wine industry. |
|                | • Should the State Legislature as initially presented by the Department of Revenue in 2003 implement the Streamlined Sales Tax (SST), the City would likely lose critical sales tax revenues causing additional significant negative pressure on the City's ability to provide critical services to its citizens.   |
|                | • They gain some revenue from new construction that helps provide some relief to the revenue losses due to I747 and the loss of MVET.   |

|                  | Q6 - Have they considered annexations/incorporations but not done it due to expected costs?  |
|------------------|--|
| Clarkston        | No   |
| Clallam County   | Not Applicable City question—not relevant to counties  |
| Forks            | No   |
| Port Angeles     | No. If they only considered the costs, then they would not have went forward with the recent annexation. However, they consider the annexation as a long-term investment in economic growth that will generate long-term gains for the city.   |
| Sequim           | No   |
| Clark County     | Not Applicable, but the interview found: Politics seems to be a bigger factor to cities in Clark County than costs or revenues. Smaller cities may decide based on costs more than larger cities. Some of the bigger cities seem to have foregone annexation of some area with infrastructure that is below the standards of the city. Many of the smaller cities are engaged in annexing vacant land for future expansion. Also, the larger cities seem to have shifted to annexing vacant land as well because the new state annexation law makes it much harder to annex populated areas.   |
| Battle Ground    | We are currently considering delaying a proposed annexation to a future date due to costs. But, although we have discussed a delay, we haven't actually denied a particular annexation.  |
| Camas            | No   |
| Vancouver        | The City has considered cost of service provisions and has decided not to pursue because of these costs.   |
| Washougal        | No   |
| Yacolt           | No   |
| Pierce County    | Not Applicable   |
| Bonney Lake      | Yes. For some time now, the county has wanted us to annex a large area – one that is entirely residential. It is all developed but in substandard conditions that the city would have to update if we annexed. It would require updated sewer, roads, etc. We haven't done it because of these costs.  |
| Puyallup         | No. They also look at the benefits (e.g., easier provision of police, fire, and street services).  |
| Steilacoom       | Yes. They are more or less surrounded by other jurisdictions, but there is one area of unincorporated territory next to them that is entirely residential. They have not sought to annex this area because the cost of service provision would outweigh revenue gains.   |
| University Place | Not applicable. (? Are they surrounded?)   |
| Spokane County   | Not Applicable   |
| Fairfield        | No. This has not been an issue.  |
| Medical Lake     | The city has tried to keep development with the urban growth area because of the cost of infrastructure. This has caused significant in filling within the city limits. However, development is beginning to spill outside the UGA and the city may do an annexation this year. The city, however, is remaining cautious and is trying to avoid situations that would necessitate large outlays for infrastructure outside the city limits.  |
| Spokane Valley   | We've only been incorporated for a couple of years, but there are some possibilities for annexations. Also, the city is looking at annexation policy since the county is considering revising the UGA. Some developers have vested rights in parcel that could end up in the new UGA and this would affect the city's ability to annex those areas. We are also in discussions with the county over the UGA and annexations because we would prefer to cooperate with the county on issues such as annexations, infrastructure, cost of providing services, etc. We'll be exploring those issues with the county in hopes of arriving at mutually beneficial policies and positions. |

| Yakima County | Not applicable   |
|---------------|--|
| Granger       | No. All annexations with population have been done at the request of property owners in    |
|               | the annexation. We don't turn down anyone that wants to be annexed.                        |
| Harrah        | No, not at this point.   |
| Toppenish     | No.  |
| Yakima        | No, as they assess the financial feasibility of an annexation well before it ever reaches  |
|               | high-level consideration by the city's legislative body. They do realize that there is     |
|               | political sensitivity associated with annexations and this could prevent an annexation     |
|               | option from being approved. The loss of revenue to the County following an annexation      |
|               | seems to promote a tension between City and County, which can interfere with sound         |
|               | planning. They feel as though the Legislature might help with these conflicts by better    |
|               | defining the roles of cities and counties, in terms of service standards and land use      |
|               | restriction differences in a county vs. a city. Some people want to remain in              |
|               | unincorporated areas, but want urban-area quality of services in these places. They do not |
|               | support the county delivering services at this level, and feel that the legislature could  |
|               | clarify standards for service delivery in cities and unincorporated areas and assist in    |
|               | educating the public on the differences between rural (county) and urban (city) services   |
|               | and restraints.  |

|                | Q7 - Use of Impact Fees  |
|----------------|--|
| Clarkston      | No   |
| Clallam County | No. It has not been politically viable to do so.   |
| Forks          | Question not included in their questionnaire   |
| Port Angeles   | They do impose some modest impact fees. They try to keep the fees small so as to attract     |
|                | new businesses to the area.  |
|                | (Yet they checked no to all the categories supplied)   |
|                | In other entered: Items such as sidewalks  |
| Sequim         | Not imposed yet  |
| Clark County   | Clark County imposes #1, #2 and #3. The county has an agreement on impact fees with          |
|                | the City of Vancouver. Clark County just formed a metropolitan park district, too, that will |
|                | automatically expand with the UGA.   |
| Battle Ground  | Streets/Roads _X_  |
|                | Parks/Open Space/Recreation facilitiesyesX   |
|                | No on the other categories, but this text was included:                                      |
|                | We have applied impact fees for fire, parks, and traffic.                                    |
| Camas          | Yes Streets/Roadsyes   |
|                | Parks/Open Space/Recreation facilitiesyes  |
|                | School facilitiesyes   |
|                | Fire protection facilities in jurisdictions that are not part of a fire district _yes        |
|                | Othersewer/water   |
| Vancouver      | The City has imposed impact fees and they have been used for both Streets/roads and          |
|                | Parks/Open Space/Recreation facilities acquisitions and development.                         |
| Washougal      | Yes, fees are imposed  |
|                | Streets/Doods Vos  |
|                | Streets/RoadsYes<br>Parks/Open Space/Recreation facilitiesYes                                |
|                | School facilitiesYes   |
|                | Fire protection facilities in jurisdictions that are not part of a fire districtYes          |
|                | Other was not checked.   |
| Yacolt         | Yes, for school facilities   |
| 1 acon         | 1 cs, for senior racinges  |

| Pierce County    | Pierce County has impact fees for parks and recreation. This has worked very well for the county. Impact fees for school districts are also imposed if the school district asks for them.  |
|------------------|--|
| Bonney Lake      | Streets/Roads Parks/Open Space/Recreation facilitiesYesX School facilitiesX_No Fire protection facilities in jurisdictions that are not part of a fire districtNo Other (no response) We have applied impact fees for traffic, parks, and schools (the money goes entirely to schools; none to us), updated storm water impact fees, water and sewer fees.               |
| Puyallup         | Yes. The fees have helped to defray the costs of growth.  Streets/RoadsYes (but only for one commercial area) Parks/Open Space/Recreation facilitiesYes School facilitiesYes Fire protection facilities in jurisdictions that are not part of a fire districtNo Other (no response)  |
| Steilacoom       | Yes, for 3. schools. Needed to renovate/improve facilities.  |
| University Place | Streets/RoadsNot in the past; they are considering doing so.  Parks/Open Space/Recreation facilitiesYes  School facilitiesNo  Fire protection facilities in jurisdictions that are not part of a fire districtNo  Other  |
| Spokane County   | Not asked the question – interviewed before this question was added to survey form.  |
| Fairfield        | No. Do not impose these fees.  |
| Medical Lake     | Yes, Medical Lake has used impact for 2, 3 and 4. We like impact fees because they help to pay some of the costs for growth. Also, there's enough flexibility to allow the city to negotiate for facilities or amenities in lieu of the impact fees.   |
| Spokane Valley   | No. However, we are looking at ways to share the cost of development in the community.   |
| Yakima County    | No comment   |
| Granger          | No. We're looking at ways to pay for growth. Impact fees could be part of our development plan.  |
| Harrah           | Streets/RoadsNot in the past; they are considering doing so.  Parks/Open Space/Recreation facilitiesYes  School facilitiesNo  Fire protection facilities in jurisdictions that are not part of a fire districtNo  Other - no response here   |
| Toppenish        | No. Revenues would be exceedingly small since there has been very little development and little more is expected unless some of the significant issues get cleared up.   |
| Yakima           | No, but they are talking about it. The development community strongly opposes them and the city cannot afford to discourage growth and development, but they need to provide services and infrastructure upgrades necessitated by such development, so they are walking a fine line between using impact fees and providing these services/upgrades through other means. |
|                  | Ol. Other Comments   |
| Cl. 1            | Q8: - Other Comments   |

|                | Q8: - Other Comments   |
|----------------|--|
| Clarkston      | None   |
| Clallam County | No comments  |
| Forks          | State fiscal changes have been the most important factor affecting local government            |
|                | finances. The point of sale distribution of local sales taxes has hurt rural areas that do not |

|                  | have large retailers. There are great disparities between cities that have large retail centers and those that do not.  |
|------------------|---|
|                  | Rural areas do not have the revenues needed to provide the services required by state mandates. The urban-rural split needs to be addressed. There is a net drain of resources away from rural areas. For example, the taxes from state timber do not stay in Forks.  |
| Port Angeles     | No additional comments.   |
| Sequim           | None  |
| Clark County     | The fastest growing revenue source for Clark County is intergovernmental transfers in the form of grants from the state and federal governments.  |
| Battle Ground    | None  |
| Camas            | He is interested in the study and would like to receive the results.  |
| Vancouver        | No additional comments  |
| Washougal        | No additional comments  |
| Yacolt           | None  |
| Pierce County    | (1) Cities have a tendency to cherry-pick when annexing. They like to annex areas with  |
| ·                | high revenues but small expenditures. Then the county is left with areas that have small revenues but significant expenditures associated with them. (2) Funding basis for counties compared to cities disadvantages counties. Cities can impose a municipal B&O tax and a utility tax to fund general fund activities. These are not available to counties. Counties would like to have the utility tax. (3) Changing sourcing on sales tax would help Pierce County and most other counties. (4) State funding for county delivery of services should be re-examined to see if the funding is at the appropriate levels.                                  |
| Bonney Lake      | None  |
| Puyallup         | We should note that each jurisdiction is different—and not just in terms of the financial impacts or annexations. There are substantial political differences across cities with respect to attitudes towards growth.   |
| Steilacoom       | Feels that the Central Puget Sound region Growth Management Hearings Board is "out of control," are legislating from the bench, by requiring at least 4 housing units per acre. This is pre-empting local legislative authority, with adverse impacts on the community and quality of life. These decisions should be made by local governments   |
| University Place | None.   |
| Spokane County   | None  |
| Fairfield        | None  |
| Medical Lake     | One of our most significant issues is provision of services to Eastern States Hospital. We can negotiate with them over provision of fire protection services. However, provision of police services costs several times more per year than provision of fire protections services and the city cannot negotiate with the hospital on them and does not get paid or reimbursed. Whenever a resident wanders off the hospital grounds the city police are called and we respond. However, we have a small police force and it takes the whole force to respond and still maintain services to the city. We don't get anything from the state for doing this. |
|                  | Costs of providing services also increase rapidly because of costs like rapidly increasing health insurance premiums for city employees.  |
| Spokane Valley   | The Legislature and initiative writers should be required to explain impacts of legislation on local governments to voters so that they can understand what will happen. Classic example is I-695. MVET might have been reformed in a satisfactory way rather than repealed entirely.   |

| Yakima County | It would be nice if someone could convince voters that you can get more services with less  |
|---------------|---|
|               | revenue.  |
| Granger       | No response   |
| Harrah        | The County Conference on Government in Yakima is very important for the small towns in the county. Often fiscal planning is very difficult, and can be expensive (in terms of hiring planner, etc). Without CCOG, if would be difficult to proceed with planning. Growth management planning is critical for small towns. Such planning – and related fees – are often not welcome by community residents. The GMA was crucial in bringing zoning ordinance to Harrah – this was something the city had hoped to do but residents had opposed it. |
| Toppenish     | None  |
| Yakima        | They feel Federal and State unfunded mandates have had significant negative fiscal impacts on the City. For example, recent standards for storm water regulations were driven by west side precipitation levels, which make no sense in Yakima where precipitation levels are 20% of Westside precipitation levels. In many cases these standards also drive up the cost of planning.   |
|               | They have tried to assist 2 school districts with their growth plan by providing the school districts with population changes based on new planned development within their district boundaries; however the school districts have stated that they are only allowed to base growth on estimates of births and deaths, and they are not allowed to include estimated populations associated with new subdivisions. This is not an effective way for schools to plan and prepare for future needs.   |